

PUBLIC FORUM

This column is open for the discussion by correspondents of questions of interest. The Charlottetown Guardian does not necessarily endorse the opinions of correspondents.

Continued from page 4

ing but make a bad situation worse. Here is a little more.

The records of the Police Court in Halifax, N. S., show that under Government Sale there have been far more convictions...

Over and over we have been told that the importance of respect for law is one great reason why we should change from Prohibition to Control.

And how about P. E. I.? There are some of our people who want Government Sale, but the brewers and distillers of central Canada want it far more, and their only concern about the law is to get it out of the way as far as possible.

And again I insist, the people of this Island cannot afford to send a million dollars a year out of the province for a beverage that contains a narcotic poison, and that we all know is a dependable producer of illness, crime and poverty.

Roger Babson, the noted economist said, "For every dollar of whiskey revenue received, we have lost \$20 in the loss of legitimate trade and the cost of the damage done to society."

And there is the cry that Prohibition is doing a lot of harm to our young people. Frankly, we don't believe it. Scandalously poor enforcement is doing a lot of harm to our young people and to everybody else.

But what of the young people in the provinces under Government Sale? The Social Service Council and Temperance Alliance of Nova Scotia tell us that "Complaints from all counties in the province are to the effect that never under Prohibition were the young men and young women given to drink" as they are under Government Sale.

And how about those younger? There was a cute little illustration used in the press a week or more ago by an opponent of Prohibition, in which he said that the Prohibitionist was standing at the wrong end of the cow, putting in the feed

while the bootlegger was getting all the milk. Let us reply that the writer is a poor judge of cows and of milk too. Here is another contrast that is not so imaginary. The Chicago Tribune has told us that in that city during the first year after the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment there was an enormous increase in the amount of liquor consumed, which increased from 1.5 to 2.5 gallons per capita during the same year there was a decrease of \$70,000,000 in the sales of milk. Exactly the same, on a smaller scale of course took place in Halifax. Now what do you think would likely happen in Charlottetown and Summerside?

Apparently the whole is not what which end of the cow we should stand at, but the choice is between liquor for Dad or milk for the children. Which? And by the way, it does not look as though Government Sale would be much help to the dairy business.

In closing I quote Rev. W. W. Peck, M. A., Educational Secretary, Canadian Temperance Federation, writing in 1929. "The advocates of Government Control assured the people that it would promote temperance, abolish bootlegging, remove drunkenness and crime. In no province under Government Sale have these promises been fulfilled. Facilities for obtaining drink have been multiplied. Liquor has been introduced into family and social life as never before, and new temptations have been placed in the way of youth. Drunkenness, motor accidents, vagrancy, disorderly conduct, poverty and jail population, the usual effects of drink have assumed alarming proportions."

And so, Sir, and everybody else, make no apology for opposing Government Sale of liquor, with every ounce of strength I have. And I trust that those who have been elected to take care of our legislation on Prince Edward Island will realize that in resting the advances of brewers and distillers from outside our province they have a good fat majority of determined P. E. Islanders behind them.

I am, Sir, etc., T. R. GOUDGE

P.S.—It was decidedly comical and a very welcome coincidence that "Pro Moderation's" letter about "piffle" and "poh, poh" in last Saturday's Guardian, appeared right beside mine. And since he decared that there is nothing doing with us in liquor, how fortunate that I happened to refer in that particular letter to our school book, "Physiology and Hygiene," chapter XX. And wasn't I humiliated at being let out of the list of notables! But "A little nonsense now and then is relished by the best of men," so we should worry!

T. R. G.

WHYS AND WHEREFORES

Sir,—The chief issue, as I see it, in the recent election in Fourth Prince was Prohibition versus Beer and Wine. Mr. Bell used neither money nor run to influence the election and went down to defeat, a martyr to the great cause of Prohibition. On the other hand, Mr. Wright assured us that he was in perfect accord with the policies of the powers that be, and everyone knows that the cause of the Liberal Party has up its sleeve a Beer and Wine Law. As we are all strong supporters of the beer and wine candidate.

Now we are glad to say that our confidence in Mr. Wright has not been misplaced, and we already see the fruits of his efforts. Although election was held only a few days ago, already the doctors have been supplied with tomes of beer and wine scripts, a new scrip printed on a dirty colored paper, which gives them the appearance of over-typed sheets of shreds from the unlaundershed sheet of a colored infant. But although this is a welcome concession, we beg to inform Mr.

Wright that it is not enough. We do not want to be bothered going to a doctor every time we require a cask of wine or a hoghead of beer. We want our beer and wine as free as the air we breathe, and we wish to say also that we want it strong. We are a strong-junged people and can blow the froth off any beer. We voted solid for the beer and wine government candidate, now we want quick results.

Let the Premier remember when repeating his alphabet (I said he is learning to read) that although A may stand for Alberton, Where they like their whisky clear, That B stands for old Bedouque And Bedouque it stands for Beer. I am, Sir, etc., B. E. DEQUE.

CONTROL OF THE CONSUMPTION OF LIQUOR

Sir,—In your issue of the 2nd inst, a writer, "Pro Patria," tries to insinuate that in my reference to the "cap-trap" of silly reasoning exhibited by Malcolm MacNeill, I was trying to deride his learning. Such is not true. I have all along been referring not to the scholarly attainments of my opponents but to their lack of sound reasoning. I do not wish to doubt "Pro Patria's" statement regarding Malcolm MacNeill's holding a scholarship at the Prince of Wales College (but in any case it has no bearing on the question of Prohibition), but I fail to understand the name Malcolm MacNeill listed anywhere in the College Calendar of the current year either as a scholarship winner or otherwise. In all fairness to Malcolm MacNeill (and the writer believes in being absolutely fair) "Pro Patria" or his informant ought to have supplied the date or year as proof of his statement. As to the educational attainments of other members of Malcolm MacNeill's family, I fail to see what bearing these have on Malcolm MacNeill's personal outlook on the question of Prohibition. Mr. MacNeill's letter contained good arguments, none of which I undertook to refute with facts. If "Pro Patria" will read my letter over again, he will see that it was largely a reply to "Bert Walker," concluded with certain remarks on Malcolm MacNeill's letter. He will find, if he can read intelligently, that the first part of my letter refutes all of Malcolm MacNeill's arguments. The mere fact that Malcolm MacNeill writes well does not mean that he is a trained logician. That was the crux of my letter, a point which Pro Patria evidently failed to grasp. Nowhere in my remarks have I said anything discourteous to any writer solely from the point of view of composition, but I certainly have made caustic remarks on what I consider to be utter disregard of the most elementary principles of logic.

If Pro Patria is not satisfied with the refutation of the main argument in Malcolm MacNeill's letter, I shall repeat it in greater detail and illustrate by way of comparison, the error in the argument which I consider to be utter disregard of the most elementary principles of logic.

If Pro Patria is not satisfied with the refutation of the main argument in Malcolm MacNeill's letter, I shall repeat it in greater detail and illustrate by way of comparison, the error in the argument which I consider to be utter disregard of the most elementary principles of logic.

High average, Junior, Jean McKenzie, 87%.

High average, senior, Annie MacLeod, 82%.

Teacher—Annie M. Dymont.

YESTERDAY'S LOCAL MARKET QUOTATIONS

Corrected For Every Wednesday & Saturday's Issue.

PRODUCE MARKET

Hay pressed, 65c

Straw pressed, 75c

RETAIL MARKET

Celery bunch, 20c

Onions lb, 12c

Beets lb, 10c

Carrots lb, 10c

Celery hearts, 20c

Peas pk, 15c

Apples doz, 20c

Apples doz, 20c

Spinach lb, 10c

Parsley head, 15c

Carrots head, 12c

Veal lb, 12c

Roast beef, 12c

which is causing such disrespect for law due to the fact that it is based upon a wrong principle, and that it is administered by magistrates and judges who do not themselves obey the law (for the obvious reason that it is unjust). Having passed such legislation, let us adopt a campaign of education, extortion, and moral suasion to promote the cause of temperance.

Another point worthy of our earnest consideration is that of securing for the government the money at present going into the pockets of bootleggers. Why not have the government enact laws that will decrease taxes (the farmers pay a great deal in taxes) by securing revenue which is pilfered by the host of bootleggers now operating in this province? In these years of depression the farmers are bearing the burdens and heat of the day, and are being excessively taxed one way or another. Why continue "touching" the farmers' pockets? Why not introduce government control and thus secure the revenues that are going to swell the private coffers of the bootleggers? But my prohibition friends will now say that I am showing my hand, eye, cloven hoof, when I suggest this important phase of the question. Let me repeat Pro Patria and others that I am a true patriot—my fatherland comes before the bootlegger every time. Thus do I emphasize my stand against what I have called the piffle used by some of my opponents under the guise of my opinion, and the name Malcolm MacNeill listed anywhere in the College Calendar of the current year either as a scholarship winner or otherwise. In all fairness to Malcolm MacNeill (and the writer believes in being absolutely fair) "Pro Patria" or his informant ought to have supplied the date or year as proof of his statement. As to the educational attainments of other members of Malcolm MacNeill's family, I fail to see what bearing these have on Malcolm MacNeill's personal outlook on the question of Prohibition. Mr. MacNeill's letter contained good arguments, none of which I undertook to refute with facts. If "Pro Patria" will read my letter over again, he will see that it was largely a reply to "Bert Walker," concluded with certain remarks on Malcolm MacNeill's letter. He will find, if he can read intelligently, that the first part of my letter refutes all of Malcolm MacNeill's arguments. The mere fact that Malcolm MacNeill writes well does not mean that he is a trained logician. That was the crux of my letter, a point which Pro Patria evidently failed to grasp. Nowhere in my remarks have I said anything discourteous to any writer solely from the point of view of composition, but I certainly have made caustic remarks on what I consider to be utter disregard of the most elementary principles of logic.

PARK CORNER SCHOOL

Standing of Park Corner School for February:

Grade X-1, Annie MacLeod.

Grade VII-1, Gertrude Graham;

2, Willard Stewart; 3, Hollis Mackenzie.

Grade VI-1, Layton Stewart; 2, Sutherland Montgomery.

Grade V-1, Irene Underhill; 2, Marion Jollymore; 3, Leigh MacKenzie.

Grade IV-1, Roma Montgomery;

2, Nina MacLeod; 3, June MacKenzie.

Grade III (Sr.)-1, Doris De'ancy;

Grade III (Jr.)-1, Donald Cousins; 2, Everett Burt.

Grade II-1, Jean MacKenzie.

Grade I (a)-1, Jimmy Montgomery.

Grade I (b)-1, Margaret Montgomery.

Grade I (c)-1, Vernon Cousins.

Perfect attendance—Margaret Montgomery, Jimmy Montgomery, Roma Montgomery, Sutherland Montgomery.

High average, Junior, Jean McKenzie, 87%.

High average, senior, Annie MacLeod, 82%.

Teacher—Annie M. Dymont.

YESTERDAY'S LOCAL MARKET QUOTATIONS

Corrected For Every Wednesday & Saturday's Issue.

PRODUCE MARKET

Hay pressed, 65c

Straw pressed, 75c

RETAIL MARKET

Celery bunch, 20c

Onions lb, 12c

Beets lb, 10c

Carrots lb, 10c

Celery hearts, 20c

Peas pk, 15c

Apples doz, 20c

Apples doz, 20c

Spinach lb, 10c

Parsley head, 15c

Carrots head, 12c

Veal lb, 12c

Roast beef, 12c

Steak lb, 12c

Beef pk, 12c

Stew meat, 10c

Chicken, 10c

Fowl, 10c

Mutton, 10c

Butter, 10c

Eggs doz, 20c

Cod dry lb, 15c

Corned Mackerel each, 10c

Haddock lb, 10c

Produce Prices

(Canadian Press)

MONTREAL, March 3—Barley C W no 3 47.

Wheat, no 2 91.

Oats, C W no 3 39.

Oats, feed no 1 37.

which is causing such disrespect for law due to the fact that it is based upon a wrong principle, and that it is administered by magistrates and judges who do not themselves obey the law (for the obvious reason that it is unjust). Having passed such legislation, let us adopt a campaign of education, extortion, and moral suasion to promote the cause of temperance.

Another point worthy of our earnest consideration is that of securing for the government the money at present going into the pockets of bootleggers. Why not have the government enact laws that will decrease taxes (the farmers pay a great deal in taxes) by securing revenue which is pilfered by the host of bootleggers now operating in this province? In these years of depression the farmers are bearing the burdens and heat of the day, and are being excessively taxed one way or another. Why continue "touching" the farmers' pockets? Why not introduce government control and thus secure the revenues that are going to swell the private coffers of the bootleggers? But my prohibition friends will now say that I am showing my hand, eye, cloven hoof, when I suggest this important phase of the question. Let me repeat Pro Patria and others that I am a true patriot—my fatherland comes before the bootlegger every time. Thus do I emphasize my stand against what I have called the piffle used by some of my opponents under the guise of my opinion, and the name Malcolm MacNeill listed anywhere in the College Calendar of the current year either as a scholarship winner or otherwise. In all fairness to Malcolm MacNeill (and the writer believes in being absolutely fair) "Pro Patria" or his informant ought to have supplied the date or year as proof of his statement. As to the educational attainments of other members of Malcolm MacNeill's family, I fail to see what bearing these have on Malcolm MacNeill's personal outlook on the question of Prohibition. Mr. MacNeill's letter contained good arguments, none of which I undertook to refute with facts. If "Pro Patria" will read my letter over again, he will see that it was largely a reply to "Bert Walker," concluded with certain remarks on Malcolm MacNeill's letter. He will find, if he can read intelligently, that the first part of my letter refutes all of Malcolm MacNeill's arguments. The mere fact that Malcolm MacNeill writes well does not mean that he is a trained logician. That was the crux of my letter, a point which Pro Patria evidently failed to grasp. Nowhere in my remarks have I said anything discourteous to any writer solely from the point of view of composition, but I certainly have made caustic remarks on what I consider to be utter disregard of the most elementary principles of logic.

CONTROL OF THE CONSUMPTION OF LIQUOR

Sir,—In your issue of the 2nd inst, a writer, "Pro Patria," tries to insinuate that in my reference to the "cap-trap" of silly reasoning exhibited by Malcolm MacNeill, I was trying to deride his learning. Such is not true. I have all along been referring not to the scholarly attainments of my opponents but to their lack of sound reasoning. I do not wish to doubt "Pro Patria's" statement regarding Malcolm MacNeill's holding a scholarship at the Prince of Wales College (but in any case it has no bearing on the question of Prohibition), but I fail to understand the name Malcolm MacNeill listed anywhere in the College Calendar of the current year either as a scholarship winner or otherwise. In all fairness to Malcolm MacNeill (and the writer believes in being absolutely fair) "Pro Patria" or his informant ought to have supplied the date or year as proof of his statement. As to the educational attainments of other members of Malcolm MacNeill's family, I fail to see what bearing these have on Malcolm MacNeill's personal outlook on the question of Prohibition. Mr. MacNeill's letter contained good arguments, none of which I undertook to refute with facts. If "Pro Patria" will read my letter over again, he will see that it was largely a reply to "Bert Walker," concluded with certain remarks on Malcolm MacNeill's letter. He will find, if he can read intelligently, that the first part of my letter refutes all of Malcolm MacNeill's arguments. The mere fact that Malcolm MacNeill writes well does not mean that he is a trained logician. That was the crux of my letter, a point which Pro Patria evidently failed to grasp. Nowhere in my remarks have I said anything discourteous to any writer solely from the point of view of composition, but I certainly have made caustic remarks on what I consider to be utter disregard of the most elementary principles of logic.

If Pro Patria is not satisfied with the refutation of the main argument in Malcolm MacNeill's letter, I shall repeat it in greater detail and illustrate by way of comparison, the error in the argument which I consider to be utter disregard of the most elementary principles of logic.

If Pro Patria is not satisfied with the refutation of the main argument in Malcolm MacNeill's letter, I shall repeat it in greater detail and illustrate by way of comparison, the error in the argument which I consider to be utter disregard of the most elementary principles of logic.

High average, Junior, Jean McKenzie, 87%.

High average, senior, Annie MacLeod, 82%.

Teacher—Annie M. Dymont.

YESTERDAY'S LOCAL MARKET QUOTATIONS

Corrected For Every Wednesday & Saturday's Issue.

PRODUCE MARKET

Hay pressed, 65c

Straw pressed, 75c

RETAIL MARKET

Celery bunch, 20c

Onions lb, 12c

Beets lb, 10c

Carrots lb, 10c

Celery hearts, 20c

Peas pk, 15c

Apples doz, 20c

Apples doz, 20c

Spinach lb, 10c

Parsley head, 15c

Carrots head, 12c

Veal lb, 12c

Roast beef, 12c

Steak lb, 12c

Beef pk, 12c

Stew meat, 10c

Chicken, 10c

Fowl, 10c

Mutton, 10c

Butter, 10c

Eggs doz, 20c

Cod dry lb, 15c

Corned Mackerel each, 10c

Haddock lb, 10c

Produce Prices

(Canadian Press)

MONTREAL, March 3—Barley C W no 3 47.

Wheat, no 2 91.

Oats, C W no 3 39.

Oats, feed no 1 37.

Flour, spring wheat patents, firsts \$5.60.

Flour seconds \$5.20.

Flour bakers \$5.10.

Flour winter wheat patents, choice \$4.00.

Flour white corn \$4.60.

Bran ton \$19.25.

Shorts ton \$20.25.

Middlings ton \$3.25.

Rolls oats \$2.90.

Hay no 2 per ton carlots \$9.00.

STOCK QUOTATIONS

Morning Stock Letter

(Received over Pittfield and Co's Private Wire)

NEW YORK, March 3—It is expected that the President will submit his tax program to Congress today or tomorrow. Technically, the market is in a very interesting position. Yesterday the Dow Jones industrial average closed just below the high closing of the year. Although the rails are lagged, the ability of both averages to go into new high ground would be especially encouraging, the ability of one without confirmation of the other would call for caution. Nevertheless, we think yesterday's market was friends for the future. Let me repeat Pro Patria and others that I am a true patriot—my fatherland comes before the bootlegger every time. Thus do I emphasize my stand against what I have called the piffle used by some of my opponents under the guise of my opinion, and the name Malcolm MacNeill listed anywhere in the College Calendar of the current year either as a scholarship winner or otherwise. In all fairness to Malcolm MacNeill (and the writer believes in being absolutely fair) "Pro Patria" or his informant ought to have supplied the date or year as proof of his statement. As to the educational attainments of other members of Malcolm MacNeill's family, I fail to see what bearing these have on Malcolm MacNeill's personal outlook on the question of Prohibition. Mr. MacNeill's letter contained good arguments, none of which I undertook to refute with facts. If "Pro Patria" will read my letter over again, he will see that it was largely a reply to "Bert Walker," concluded with certain remarks on Malcolm MacNeill's letter. He will find, if he can read intelligently, that the first part of my letter refutes all of Malcolm MacNeill's arguments. The mere fact that Malcolm MacNeill writes well does not mean that he is a trained logician. That was the crux of my letter, a point which Pro Patria evidently failed to grasp. Nowhere in my remarks have I said anything discourteous to any writer solely from the point of view of composition, but I certainly have made caustic remarks on what I consider to be utter disregard of the most elementary principles of logic.

MONTREAL, March 3—Can Celanese declared a dividend of 40 cents a share on the common for the quarter ended March 31, 1935. In addition to the regular quarterly dividend of \$1.75 on the preferred. A participating dividend of 95 cents a share, in respect of the 1935 year was declared. Directors also set March 31st, as the date for payment of interest to holders of the income funding rights of Dec. 31.

MONTREAL, March 3—A weak undertone prevailed in most sections of Montreal livestock markets today with prices barely steady. Cattle division found little support while calf and hog prices were unchanged.

Receipts were 125 cattle, 408 calves, 435 hogs and six sheep and lambs.

Two loads of western cattle brought no buyers early dealing and a fair amount of stock was common to fair cows and bulls.

Cows brought \$2.50 to \$3.50. Canners and cutters \$2.25 and common bulls \$3 to \$3.50.

Bulk of calves were sold in mixed lots of \$8 to \$9.50. Common light veals brought \$6.

Bacon hogs were steady at \$8.75 fed and watered, with 1 premium fed and watered, heavies and lights were \$8.25 and extra heavies \$7.75. Sows were \$7.25 to \$7.75.

LIVESTOCK

(Canadian Press)

MONTREAL, March 3—A weak undertone prevailed in most sections of Montreal livestock markets today with prices barely steady. Cattle division found little support while calf and hog prices were unchanged.

Receipts were 125 cattle, 408 calves, 435 hogs and six sheep and lambs.

Two loads of western cattle brought no buyers early dealing and a fair amount of stock was common to fair cows and bulls.

Cows brought \$2.50 to \$3.50. Canners and cutters \$2.25 and common bulls \$3 to \$3.50.

Bulk of calves were sold in mixed lots of \$8 to \$9.50. Common light veals brought \$6.

Bacon hogs were steady at \$8.75 fed and watered, with 1 premium fed and watered, heavies and lights were \$8.25 and extra heavies \$7.75. Sows were \$7.25 to \$7.75.

EXCHANGE

France franc .06608

Germany reichsmark 4.064

Great Britain pound 4.9383

Holland florin .6808

Hungary pengo .2988

Japan yen .2913

New Zealand pound 4.0227

Norway krone .2507

South Africa pound 4.9322

Spain peseta .1381

Sweden krona .2573

Switzerland franc .3301